## MAIL STOP AMENDMENT

É UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants:

C.I. Lupu et al.

Attorney Docket No.: MSFT114614

Application No.: 09/544,512

Group Art Unit: 2124

Filed:

April 6, 2000

Examiner: T.A. Vu

Title:

FIXING INCOMPATIBLE APPLICATIONS

USING A LIGHT DEBUGGER

## **RESPONSE**

April 22, 2005

## TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request that the above-identified application be reexamined.

The Office Action mailed on December 1, 2004 ("Office Action"), rejected all pending claims in the application.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-18 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-36 of U.S. Patent No. 6,745,385 (hereinafter "the '385 patent") in view of Edwards et al., U.S. Patent No. 5.901,315. In response to this obviousness-type double patenting rejections, attached is a terminal disclaimer that applicants submit to obviate such a ground of rejection.

Claims 1, 5-7, 11-13, and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being Three Approaches, (How to Introduce unpatentable over Stone, "In Memory Patching: Marvels)," March 1998, Debugger and Other **Breakpoints** in Automated an <a href="http://fravia.anticrack.de/stone1.htm">http://fravia.anticrack.de/stone1.htm</a> (hereinafter "Stone") in view of Lillich, U.S. Patent Claims 3-4, 9-10, and 15-16 were rejected under No. 5,619,698 (hereinafter "Lillich"). 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone in view of Nowlin, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,484,309 (hereinafter "Nowlin").